

154 COMMENTARY ON MACAULAY'S  
HISTORY

necessary materials. Hence Macaulay is inclined to attribute to the iniquity of the age or the corruption of individuals, failures and evils really due to defective organisation.<sup>1</sup>

As a military historian Macaulay's chief defect is the propensity to substitute a vague and rhetorical description for a statement of the facts. There are some serious omissions in his narrative. The strength of the force with which William of Orange landed in England is very material. It is the first question which a soldier who was writing an account of the campaign would seek to determine. Macaulay however tells us that James had at his disposal in England about forty thousand men,<sup>2</sup> and that the army he assembled at Salisbury on the news of William's landing, 'though inferior in discipline to that of William, was superior in numbers'. But he does not mention the numbers in either army.<sup>3</sup> He describes picturesquely the entrance of William's army into Exeter. First came two hundred gentlemen under the Earl of Macclesfield, 'glittering in helmets and cuirasses' and 'mounted on Flemish war horses'. There followed a squadron of Swedish horsemen in black armour and fur cloaks \ Then came 'a long column of the whiskered infantry of Switzerland'—and so on.<sup>4</sup> With

all these  
details there are no figures. Bishop Burnet  
had no preten-  
sions to being a military historian, but he  
does tell us that

<sup>1</sup> A good illustration of the defects of the military  
administration of the  
time is supplied by Mr. Fortescue's account of the  
expedition sent to the  
West Indies in 1695. The British Army, pp. 24-26. The  
administration is  
dealt with at length by Col. Walton.

<sup>2</sup> III, 1106 (ix).

<sup>3</sup> According to Mr. Fortescue, James got together about  
24,000 men at  
Salisbury. History of the British Army, i. 306,  
«III<sub>f</sub> 1132-8 (ix).